



**University of
Zurich**^{UZH}

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
Main Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2014

Attitudes towards immigration and their antecedents

Heath, Anthony ; Schmidt, Peter ; Green, Eva G T ; Ramos, Alice ; Davidov, Eldad ; Ford, Robert

Abstract: This proposal is for a repeat of the module on immigration attitudes fielded in the first round of the ESS in 2002/3, which has been extensively used in cross-national research and has made a major contribution to policy debates. A decade on, major political, cultural, economic and demographic developments make this a highly opportune time for a repeat module. The proposal is to replicate those items that have been most widely used by scholars and that have been shown to have good methodological properties. These include items designed to measure attitudes to levels of immigration, the criteria for accepting migrants, attitudes to integration policy and multiculturalism, together with measures of explanatory concepts such as realistic threat and social distance. Drawing on the state-of-the-art literature, we plan to supplement these items with new items designed to strengthen the measurement of symbolic threat and of contact with migrants and minorities (which recent research suggests can be of considerable explanatory power), together with additional items designed to cover topics of current policy and theoretical debate.

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich
ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-93716>
Published Research Report
Published Version

Originally published at:

Heath, Anthony; Schmidt, Peter; Green, Eva G T; Ramos, Alice; Davidov, Eldad; Ford, Robert (2014). Attitudes towards immigration and their antecedents. London: European Social Survey.

QUESTION MODULE DESIGN TEAM (ESS ROUND 7) APPLICATION FORM FOR REPEAT MODULES¹

Please return this form by email to: Mary Keane
ess@city.ac.uk (PDF files only)

CLOSING DATE FOR APPLICATIONS: 17:00 hours UK Time on 1st May 2012

USE THE ARROW KEYS TO NAVIGATE ROUND THE FORM

1. Principal Applicant (*person to whom all correspondence will be sent*):

Forename: Anthony	Surname: Heath
Position: Professor of Sociology	
Department: Sociology	
Institution: University of Oxford	
Full Address: Department of Sociology, Manor Road Building, Manor Road, Oxford OX1 3UQ	
Tel No: + 441865553512	Email: anthony.heath@nuffield.ox.ac.uk

2. Co-Applicants (*up to 4*):

(i) Forename: Peter	Surname: Schmidt
Department: Institut für Politikwissenschaft	
Institution: Justus-Liebig-Universität Giessen	
Country: Germany	Email: Schmidt.Braunfels@t-online.de

(ii) Forename: Eva	Surname: Green
Department: Social Psychology	
Institution: Université de Lausanne	
Country: Switzerland	Email: Eva.Green@unil.ch

(iii) Forename: Alice	Surname: Ramos
Department: Instituto de Ciencias Sociais	
Institution: Universidade de Lisboa	
Country: Portugal	Email: alice.ramos@ics.ul.pt

(iv) Forename: Eldad	Surname: Davidov
Department: Sociology	
Institution: University of Zurich	
Country: Switzerland	Email: Davidov@sociologie.uzh.ch

¹ A repeat of a topic previously included on the ESS where at least 66% of questions in the repeat module are administered in an identical format to items from the earlier module.

3. Proposed title of module (*max 80 characters*):

Attitudes towards immigration and their antecedents

4. Abstract (*max 200 words*)

This proposal is for a repeat of the module on immigration attitudes fielded in the first round of the ESS in 2002/3, which has been extensively used in cross-national research and has made a major contribution to policy debates. A decade on, major political, cultural, economic and demographic developments make this a highly opportune time for a repeat module. The proposal is to replicate those items that have been most widely used by scholars and that have been shown to have good methodological properties. These include items designed to measure attitudes to levels of immigration, the criteria for accepting migrants, attitudes to integration policy and multiculturalism, together with measures of explanatory concepts such as realistic threat and social distance. Drawing on the state-of-the-art literature, we plan to supplement these items with new items designed to strengthen the measurement of symbolic threat and of contact with migrants and minorities (which recent research suggests can be of considerable explanatory power), together with additional items designed to cover topics of current policy and theoretical debate.

5. Curriculum vitae

(Please provide a brief CV for each applicant, including subject expertise, questionnaire design and analysis experience, relevant publications and record of joint working – maximum one page per applicant.)

Principal Applicant:

Anthony Heath received his Ph D from Cambridge University in 1971. He taught at the University of Oxford from 1970 until the present, first as University Lecturer, then as Official Fellow of Nuffield College, and then as the founding Professor of Sociology (Emeritus since 2010). He is also Professor of Sociology at the Institute for Social Change, Manchester University. He was elected a Fellow of the British Academy in 1992. His general area of expertise is survey research, and he has worked in a range of areas including social stratification, immigration and ethnic inequalities, social and political attitudes, political behaviour, national identity and attitudes to immigration. He was the co-Director (with Roger Jowell) of the 1983, 1987, 1992 and 1997 British Election Surveys and is currently Director of the 2010 Ethnic Minority British Election survey. He has co-ordinated a number of cross-national projects and was a consultant on questionnaire design for cross-national survey work on the State of Democracy in South Asia (with fieldwork in India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh and Nepal). He has been commissioned to write reports for many public bodies including UNDP, OECD, the Equality and Human Rights Commission, the Cabinet Office, and is currently carrying out work for the Government Office for Science on the future of a multi-ethnic Britain. Recent publications include:

Heath, Anthony and Jean Martin (in press) Can religious affiliation explain 'ethnic' inequalities in the labour market? *Ethnic and Racial Studies*.

Ford, Rob, James Tilley and Anthony Heath (2010) Land of my fathers? Economic development, ethnic division and ethnic national identity in 32 countries. *Sociological Research Online*

Cakal, Huseyin, Miles Hewstone,, Gerhard Schwär and Anthony Heath (forthcoming) An Investigation of the Social Identity Model of Collective Action and the 'Sedative' Effect of Intergroup Contact among Black and White Students in South Africa. *British Journal of Social Psychology*.

Heath, A F and Jeffery, R (eds) (2010) Diversity and Change in Modern India. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 159. Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy.

Heath, Anthony and Yaojun Li (2010) The feasibility of constructing a race equality index. DWP, Research Report 695. <http://research.dwp.gov.uk/asd/asd5/rres-index.asp>

Heath, Anthony (2010) Main determinants of educational and labour market outcomes. In OECD *Equal Opportunities? The labour market integration of the children of immigrants*. Paris: OECD.

Heath, Anthony, Cath Rethon and Sundas Ali (2010) Race and public opinion. Pp 186-208 in A Bloch and J Solomos (eds) *Race and Ethnicity in the 21st Century*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Heath, A F, Martin, J and Spreckelsen, T (2009) Cross-national comparability of survey attitude measures. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 21 (3): 293-315.

Heath A F and Jane Roberts (2008) *British Identity: its sources and possible implications for civic attitudes and behaviour*. Research report for Lord Goldsmith's Citizenship Review.

Heath, A F and S Y Cheung (eds) (2007) *Unequal Chances: Ethnic Minorities in Western Labour Markets*. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 137. Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy.

Heath, A F and Tilley, James R (2005) British national identity and attitudes towards immigration, *International Journal on Multicultural Societies* 7 (2): 119-132.

Heath, A F, Fisher, S and Smith, S (2005) The globalization of public opinion research, *Annual Review of Political Science*, 8: 297-333.

Heath, A F, Jowell, R M and Curtice, J K (2001) *The Rise of New Labour: Party Policies and Voter Choices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Curriculum vitae (continued):

Co-applicant 1:

Peter Schmidt obtained his Ph D in 1977 at the University of Mannheim in Sociology and Philosophy of Science. He then became project Director for the first general social survey (ALLBUS) at ZUMA Mannheim (now Leibniz Institute GESIS) and from 1981-1994 was Professor for Methodology at the Faculty of Social Science, University of Giessen. He then became Program Director for Societal Monitoring of Germany at ZUMA before returning to his chair at Giessen, from which he retired in 2008. He has held Guest Professorships at the Universities of Vienna, Utrecht (ICS), Oxford and Tel-Aviv. Since 2011 he has been Co-director of the International Laboratory of Socio-Cultural Research at the State Research University, Higher School of Economics(HSE), in Moscow. Throughout his career he has specialized in the methodology of survey research.

Recent publications include:

Meuleman, B., E. Davidov, P.Schmidt and J.Billiet. (2012) Social location and value priorities. A European wide comparison of the relation between social structural variables and human values. In O.Gabriel and S.Keil (Eds.) Society and Democracy in Europe. New York Routledge

Schmidt, P., J. Iser and A. Heyder (2011) Ist die Kritik an Israel antisemitisch? Die politische Orientierung macht den Unterschied. In A. Langenohl (Hrsg.) (Un)Gleichzeitigkeiten: Die demokratische Frage im 21. Jahrhundert, Marburg: Metropolis, pp. 189-224

Davidov,E., P.Schmidt and J.Billiet(eds.) (2011) Cross-Cultural Analysis: Methods and Applications. New York: Routledge.

Davidov, E., Meuleman, B., Billiet, J., & Schmidt, P. (2008). Values and Support for Immigration: A Cross-Country Comparison. European Sociological Review, 24(5): 583-599.

Davidov, Eldad, P.Schmidt and S.H.Schwartz (2008). Bringing Values back in. The adequacy of the European Social Survey to measure Values in 20 countries. Public Opinion Quarterly 72: 420-445.

Diekmann A, K. Eichner, P. Schmidt and T. Voss (2008) Rational Choice : Theoretische Analysen und empirische Resultate. Wiesbaden : VS Verl.

Schmidt, P, P. Winkelkemper, E. Schlüter and C. Wolf (2006) Welche Erklärung für Fremdenfeindlichkeit: relative Deprivation oder Autoritarismus? In A. Grasse/C. Ludwig/B. Dietz (Hrsg.): Soziale Gerechtigkeit, Wiesbaden : VS, Verl. für Sozialwiss, pp. 215-224

Schmidt, Peter, Richard Alba and Martina Wasmer (Eds.) (2003) Germans or Foreigners? Attitudes Toward Ethnic Minorities in Post-Reunification Germany, New York : Palgrave Macmillan.

Curriculum vitae (continued):

Co-applicant 2:

Eva Green received her Ph D in social sciences at the University of Lausanne in 2002. She has held visiting posts in the department of Psychology, UCLA, at ERCOMER, University of Utrecht, and is currently Visiting Professor in social psychology at the Free University of Brussels. She has taught at the University of Lausanne since 2005, where she is now senior lecturer in social psychology. Mainly using surveys (ESS, ISSP, Los Angeles County Social Survey) and experimental data, her research interests include cultural diversity and intergroup attitudes (e.g., prejudice, power relations, political identities) and survey research methodology with a particular focus on individual- and context-level antecedents of immigration attitudes.

Recent publications include:

Storari, C., & Green, E. G. T. (in press). When intergroup similarity on ingroup traits leads to restrictive immigration attitudes: The role of national identification. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*.

Green, E. G. T. & Auer, F. (in press). How Social Dominance Orientation affects union participation: The role of union identification and perceived union instrumentality. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*.

Sarrasin, O. Green, E. G. T., & Fasel, N., Christ, O., Staerklé, C., & Clémence, A. (in press). Opposition to anti-racism laws across Swiss municipalities: A multilevel analysis. *Political Psychology*. [shared first authorship]

Green, E.G.T., Sarrasin, O., Fasel, N., & Staerklé, C. (2011). Nationalism and patriotism as predictors of immigration attitudes in Switzerland : A municipality-level analysis. *Swiss Political Science Review*, 17, 369-393.

Green, E.G.T., Fasel, N., & Sarrasin, O. (2010). The more the merrier ? The effects of type of cultural diversity on exclusionary immigration attitudes in Switzerland. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, 4, 177-190.

Staerklé, C., Sidanius, J., Green, E. G. T., & Molina, L. (2010). Ethnic minority-majority asymmetry in national attitudes around the world: A multilevel analysis. *Political Psychology*, 31, 491-519.

Green, E. G. T., Krings, F., Staerklé, C., Bangerter, A., Bornand, T., Clémence, A., & Wagner, P. (2010). Keeping the vermin out: Perceived disease threat and ideological orientations as predictors of exclusionary immigration attitudes. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 20, 299-316.

Thomsen, L., Green, E. G. T., Ho, A., Levin, S., van Laar, C., Sinclair, S., & Sidanius, J. (2010). Wolves in Sheep's Clothing: SDO Asymmetrically Predicts Perceived Ethnic Victimization among White and Latino Students Across Three Years. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36, 225-238.

Green, E. G. T. (2009). Who can enter? A Multilevel Analysis on Public Support for Immigration Criteria across 20 European Countries. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 12, 41-60.

Thomsen, L., Green, E. G. T., & Sidanius, J. (2008). We will hunt them down: How Social Dominance Orientation and Right-Wing Authoritarianism fuel ethnic persecution of immigrants in fundamentally different ways. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44, 1455-1464.

Green, E. G. T. (2007). Guarding the gates of Europe: A typological analysis of immigration attitudes in 21 countries. *International Journal of Psychology*, 42, 365-379.

Green, E. G. T., Staerklé, C., & Sears, D. O. (2006). Symbolic racism and Whites' attitudes towards punitive and preventive crime policies. *Law and Human Behavior*, 30, 435-454.

Curriculum vitae (continued)

Co-applicant 3 (if applicable):

Alice Ramos received her Ph D (title: Human Values and Opposition towards Immigration in Europe) at the ICS, University of Lisbon in 2011. Her research interests include social values, prejudice and discrimination, attitudes towards immigrants and immigration and the methodology of cross-national studies: survey techniques; questionnaire design and testing; statistical techniques of comparative and longitudinal data analysis. She is a member of the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) methodological group, on behalf of the Portuguese team and a member of the Portuguese executive board of the European Social Survey (responsible for the fieldwork coordination of 5 national surveys).

Recent publications include:

Ramos, Alice, and Jorge Vala (2009). Predicting Opposition towards Immigration: Economic Resources, Social Resources and Moral Principles. In Aikaterini Gari and Kostas Mylonas (Eds.) *Quod Erat Demonstrandum: From Herodotus' Ethnographic Journeys to Cross-Cultural Research*. Athens: Pedio Books Publishing, pp 245-254.

Ramos, Alice, Jorge Vala, and Cícero Pereira (2008). Oposição a políticas anti-racistas na Europa: factores individuais e sócio-estruturais [Opposition to anti-racist policies: individual and sociostructural factors]. In Manuel V. Cabral, Karin Wall, Sofia Aboim and Filipe C. Silva (orgs.) *Itinerários-A investigação nos 25 anos do ICS* [Itineraries - Research in the 25 years of the ICS], Lisbon: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais, pp 257-281

Ramos, Alice (2006). Social values dynamics and socio-economic development. *Portuguese Journal of Social Science*, 5(1): 35-64.

Vala, Jorge, Cícero Pereira, Alice Ramos (2006). Racial prejudice, threat perception and opposition to immigration: a comparative analysis. *Portuguese Journal of Social Science*, 5(2): 119-140.

Ramos, Alice (2006). Dinâmicas dos valores sociais e desenvolvimento socioeconómico [Social values dynamics and socio-economic development]. In Jorge Vala and Anália Torres (org.) *Contextos e Atitudes Sociais na Europa* [Social contexts and attitudes in Europe]. Lisbon: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais, pp 183-220.

Ramos, Alice, Cícero Pereira, Brites, R. (2006). O método comparativo no estudo dos valores e atitudes. In Jorge Vala and A. Torres (org.) *Contextos e Atitudes Sociais na Europa* [Social contexts and attitudes in Europe]. Lisbon: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais, pp 379-407.

Vala, Jorge, Cícero Pereira, Ramos, A. (2006). Preconceito racial, percepção de ameaça e oposição à imigração [Racial prejudice, threat perceptions and opposition towards immigration]. In Jorge Vala and Anália Torres (org.) *Contextos e Atitudes Sociais na Europa* [Social contexts and attitudes in Europe]. Lisbon: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais, pp 221-250.

Ramos, Alice (2004). Metodologia do estudo sobre percepções ambientais. [The methodology of the study on environmental perceptions]. In Luísa Lima, Manuel V. Cabral and Jorge Vala (org.) *Ambiente e Desenvolvimento* [Environment and development]. Lisbon: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais, pp 239-257.

Ramos, Alice (2002). Lies, Mistakes and Statistics? A methodological approach to the survey Feelings of justice in the Chinese community of Macao. In António M. Hespanha (ed.) *Feelings of justice in the Chinese community of Maca: an inquiry*. Lisbon: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais, pp 169-180.

Curriculum vitae (continued)

Co-applicant 4 (if applicable):

Eldad Davidov obtained his Ph D in 2004 at the University of Giessen and his habilitation at Cologne University. He has subsequently taught at the universities of Mannheim, Cologne and Zurich, where he is now associate Professor. He has also worked with Professor J Billiet at Leuven University, Belgium. His main research interests are in comparative empirical social research specializing in structural equation modelling, measurement quality, cross-national and panel data analyses. His substantive interests include social values (the Schwartz value theory) and attitudes towards minorities. Recent publications include:

Voelkle, M., J. Oud, E. Davidov and P. Schmidt. (in press) An SEM approach to continuous time modeling of panel data: Relating authoritarianism and anomia. *Psychological Methods*.

Davidov, E., H. Dülmer, E. Schlüter and P. Schmidt. (in press) Using a multilevel structural equation modeling approach to explain cross-cultural measurement noninvariance (in press). *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*.

Beierlein, C., E. Davidov, S. Schwartz, P. Schmidt and B. Rammstedt (in press) Testing the discriminant validity of Schwartz' Portrait Value Questionnaire items – A replication and extension of Knoppen and Saris. *Survey Research Methods*.

Cieciuch, J. and E. Davidov (in press) Testing for measurement invariance of the PVQ-40 to measure human values across German and Polish samples. *Survey Research Methods*.

Davidov, E. and B. Meuleman. (in press) Explaining attitudes towards immigration policies in European countries: The role of human values. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*.

Davidov, E., S. Thörner, P. Schmidt, S. Gosen and C. Wolf. (2011) Level and change of group-focused enmity in Germany: Unconditional and conditional latent growth curve models with four panel waves. *Advances in Statistical Analysis*, 95, 81-100.

Schlüter, E. and E. Davidov (2011) Contextual sources of perceived group threat: Negative immigration-related news reports, immigrant group size and their interaction, Spain 1996-2007. *European Sociological Review*.

Ariely, G. and E. Davidov (2011) Assessment of measurement equivalence with cross-national and longitudinal surveys in political science (2011). *European Political Science*.

Davidov, E. and F. Depner. (2011) Testing for measurement equivalence of human values across online and paper-and-pencil surveys. *Quality & Quantity*, 45(2), 375-390.

Ariely, G. and E. Davidov (2011) Can we rate public support for democracy in a comparable way? Cross-national equivalence of democratic attitudes in the World Value Survey. *Social Indicators Research*, 104(2), 271-286.

Davidov, E. (2011) Nationalism and constructive patriotism: A longitudinal test of comparability in 22 countries with the ISSP. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 23(1), 88-103.

Davidov, E. (2009) Measurement equivalence of nationalism and constructive patriotism in the ISSP: 34 Countries in a comparative perspective. *Political Analysis*, 17, 64-82.

Meuleman, B., E. Davidov, and J. Billiet. (2009) Changing attitudes toward immigration in Europe, 2002-2007. A dynamic group conflict theory approach. *Social Science Research*, 38, 352-365.

Module proposal – for REPEAT Modules

PART 1: Theory behind proposed module (max 6000 words)

The current proposal applies for a repeat of the Immigration module included in the first wave of the ESS. It is now a decade since the original module was fielded in 2002/3. The political and academic relevance of this topic area has continued to increase as a result of a number of political, economic and demographic trends, including continuing large migration flows into and across Europe, the Great Recession of 2008 (and continuing), and the continued emergence of radical right political parties focussed on mobilising public opposition to migration.

Over sixty publications to date, including ones in highly-ranked journals such as the *American Sociological Review*, *British Journal of Political Science*, *European Journal of Political Research*, *European Sociological Review*, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *Political Psychology*, *Economics Letters*, *European Journal of Political Economy* and *European Journal of Social Psychology* demonstrate that the ESS 2002/2003 module has been effectively used in the fields of sociology, political science, social psychology and economics as well as in research methodology. It has been used to study substantive topics such as social distance from immigrants (eg Schlueter & Wagner, 2008), symbolic boundaries (Bail, 2008), entry and exclusion criteria for immigrants (Citrin & Sides, 2008; Gorodzeisky, 2011; Green, 2007, 2009; Green, Fasel, & Sarrasin, 2010), values and immigration (Davidov et al. 2008), anti-racism laws (Sarrasin et al., in press), contact with immigrants (Semyonov & Glickman, 2009), perceptions of threat and negative consequences of immigration (Hjerm, 2009; Pereira, Vala, Costa-Lopes, 2010; Semyonov & Glickman, 2009; Sides & Citrin, 2007), effects of education on immigration attitudes (Hainmueller & Hiscox, 2007), foreign-born population innumeracy (Herda, 2010), and right-wing populism (Iversflaten 2007; Oesch 2008; Rydgren, 2008).

While the module has been used for studies of attitudes in individual countries, a large proportion of this research has had a multi-level design as the 22 country sample was one of the first datasets allowing a comprehensive analysis of individual and country-level factors underlying immigration attitudes (see Coenders, Lubbers, & Scheepers, 2005). Moreover, the replication of three of the immigration items in the core module have permitted over-time studies (eg Meulemann et al. 2009).

We propose to repeat a sub-set of items from the previous module. Building on these items, we focus on theory-driven concepts, namely threat perceptions and intergroup contact, and measures adapted to changes in immigration context, policy agendas and the attitudinal climate.

The previous module

The original proposal (Preston et al. 2001) advanced persuasive arguments for covering 'immigration and attitudes': the proposal emphasized the importance of immigration as a policy issue across Europe, the concerns of 'native' populations about inflows of refugees, and the economic pressures (and demands from employers) for highly-skilled migrants in sectors such as finance. The proposal argued "Policy makers must strike a fine balance between the needs of refugees, the concerns of the native population, and the demands of employers." (Preston et al., p.1) While we would not have chosen exactly the same terms to

characterize the situation,² it is clear that issues of immigration remain of great policy importance, are of very considerable concern to many citizens of European countries, and that there are great pressures for continued immigration, both humanitarian and economic, coming both from employers and potential migrants themselves.

The original proposal also raised important questions about the social integration of migrants (and of their second and third generation descendants), the disadvantaged social positions which they occupy, their experiences of social exclusion, and their development of ethnic and national identities. These are again very important issues, given added emphasis by recent academic and policy debates about multiculturalism and its alleged failure (for a recent review see Heath and Demireva forthcoming, Heath et al., 2008), but our feeling is that this module is not the right place in which to address questions of social, cultural and economic integration of migrants and their children. The ESS does not have sufficient sample size to permit a detailed examination. While there have been some heroic attempts to use the ESS to study migrants (eg Aleksynska, 2011), the sample size means that crucial differences between minority groups typically have to be ignored (which can potentially lead to major errors of interpretation). We also believe that a module of 30 items is insufficient to study issues of the migrants' experiences and integration in various domains in addition to the attitudes and perceptions of majority groups. It is our judgement that it is much better given space and sampling constraints to focus on developing a rigorous and theoretically rich module on attitudes to immigration.

The original proposal was surprisingly atheoretical, but it nevertheless covered an important list of topics, which as noted above have been the subject of a great deal of subsequent analysis and publication by other scholars and have been used to test a number of central theories about attitudes towards immigration (see further below). The topics covered included:

- "Perceptions of current social realities" eg migrant flows;
- "Opinions regarding public policy", especially attitudes to immigration policy, to immigrants from different broad regions of origin, criteria for allowing immigration such as language or skills, asylum policy, policies regarding treatment of migrants after arrival such as antidiscrimination measures;
- "Related attitudes", such as fears about and perceptions of impact on society both in cultural and economic spheres, prejudice, perceptions of the 'genuine' extent of harassment and discrimination experienced by minorities, fears of job loss and future economic expectations.
- "Perceptions of the effects of public policy", such as perceptions of the effects of immigration, eg on economic dynamism, remedying skills shortages, cultural enrichment or threat to native culture, distinguishing effects on the individual personally and on others;
- "Perceptions of whether restrictive policies are a source of genuine hardship (eg through preventing family reunion), or prohibiting individuals from poorer countries from opportunities for economic enrichment."

² We shall not ourselves, for example, use the term 'natives' except when we explicitly intend to refer to all of those born in the country, irrespective of their ancestry and ethnicity. We shall use the term 'majority' group(s) when we wish to refer to members of the ethnic majority, although even this term does not work especially well in multinational countries such as Belgium, Switzerland or the UK.

Not all of these proposed topics were eventually included in the final questionnaire, and of those that were included some have been used by secondary analysts much more than others (e.g., items included in the core questionnaire of subsequent waves).

Our proposal

Our proposal has the following three key elements:

1. To replicate the key questions which have been the most extensively used by secondary analysts and which measure central theoretical concepts. The bulk of the module will consist of replications of this sort;
2. To add a small number of additional questions to supplement existing batteries where there are doubts about the extent to which existing batteries satisfactorily measure the theoretical concepts that scholars have wished to measure, or where there are doubts about equivalence of meaning between countries;
3. To add a small number of questions reflecting changes in the policy agenda and context of immigration and new theoretical developments.

We deal with each of these in turn.

Replication: Our experience working with national repeated cross-sections (such as the British Election Surveys and British Social Attitudes surveys) is that, although the meaning of items may change over time as the context changes, the wider scientific community has a strong preference for maintaining key items unchanged. We agree with this preference.

Our review of the published research, and our own experience using these items, indicates that the key candidates for replication include those items tapping

- attitudes to immigration policy, in particular whether policy should be made more or less restrictive;
- conditions for allowing immigrants into the country, such as education or work skills;
- attitudes towards integration policy, eg anti-discrimination legislation;
- perceptions of realistic threat;
- perceptions of symbolic threat;
- own racial prejudice (social distance);
- contact with migrants and their descendants.

The first three notions are commonly used as 'outcome' or dependent variables, whereas the last four are typically predictors or independent variables.

The theory underlying the use of these concepts in the literature argues that perceptions of realistic and symbolic threat are the main drivers of preferences for more restrictive immigration and for restricting immigration from certain countries of origin more than others (Ford, 2011; see Ceobanu & Escandell, 2010 for an overview), while racial prejudice itself is a main driver of threat perceptions and of attitudes to integration policies. A large and continually developing theoretical literature has articulated and developed these theoretical concepts (Green & Staerklé, forthcoming).

Broadly defined, threat perceptions refer to the anticipation of negative consequences related to the arrival and presence of immigrants in a country. Threat research has differentiated two main dimensions of threat that relate to anti-immigration attitudes: material or realistic threats on the one hand, and value or symbolic threats on the other (e.g., Riek et al., 2006; Scheepers, Gijsberts, & Coenders, 2002; Sears & Funk, 1990; Sniderman, Hagendoorn & Prior, 2004; Stephan & Renfro, 2002). Competition over scarce resources between national majority and minority groups and perceptions of such competition denote material threat (Esses et al., 2001; Quillian, 1995; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Scarce tangible resources include the economic assets, political power and physical well-being of majority members within a nation. Symbolic threats, in turn, encompass intangible negative consequences of immigrant presence reflected in perceptions that immigrants have differing belief systems, worldviews, and moral values (see also Sears & Henry, 2005). Thus, threat arises from a conflict in norms, values, and beliefs between the majority and immigrants and the perception that migration will change or dilute valued aspects of majority culture and identity.

ESS 2002 data has been used to examine the antecedents of threat perceptions (Schneider, 2008). Multi-level studies have investigated how country-level factors, such as GDP or proportion of immigrants, affect threat perceptions. Moreover, threat perceptions have been frequently used as predictors of immigration policy attitudes (Green, 2007, 2009, Green et al. 2010; Sarasin et al. in press, Schlueter & Wagner, 2008) and as predictors in models seeking to explain voting for extreme right parties (Oesch 2008). Given the conceptual closeness of threat appraisals and anti-immigration stances (e.g., Sniderman, Hagendoorn and Prior, 2004), it has been necessary to demonstrate that the two concepts are empirically distinct (Semyonov & Glickman, 2009; Green, 2009).

Supplementary questions to improve measurement of key theoretical concepts: one major weakness that secondary analysts have found with the ESS 2002 module is that items are heavily weighted towards measures of realistic (ie economic) threat and that there is only a single item that can be used for measuring symbolic threat. To remedy this flaw, researchers have attempted to create symbolic threat scores with proxy items that are closer to normative multiculturalism than symbolic threat (e.g., D40 “It is better for a country if almost everyone shares the same customs and traditions”, Citrin & Sides 2008, Green 2009). This is clearly sub-optimal. Indeed, it is quite possible that the key finding in the existing published research, namely that realistic threat is a more powerful predictor than symbolic threat of restrictive attitudes towards immigration, is a methodological artefact. Unless one is very fortunate with one’s single item, it is quite likely that it will have less discriminatory power than a properly-designed multi-item scale and will entail greater measurement error that cannot be controlled for. In addition it is difficult to assess the equivalence of meaning of a single item across countries. Standard techniques require comparison of a set of items, ideally at least three or four, in order to establish whether particular ones operate differently in different national contexts.

We therefore regard it as a priority to develop additional items measuring the concept of symbolic threat.

In addition to theories of symbolic and realistic threat, contact theory is becoming increasingly important for understanding prejudice and by inference perceptions of symbolic threat and opposition to immigration more generally (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011 ; McLaren, 2003). Contact, or at least opportunity for contact, is also likely to be increasing substantially in many countries as the proportion of second and third generation minorities (who will have gone through European school systems, speak the majority-group language fluently etc) increases. Given the central importance of contact in current research on attitudes to

immigrants and other outgroups, we propose to incorporate an extended set of contact items, including new items which reflect recent theoretical and empirical work on the concept.

Contact research has provided substantial evidence that direct contact with outgroup members reduces prejudice. The beneficial effects of intergroup contact, that is between the national majority and immigrants, reduces prejudice and discrimination towards immigrants among the majority population (Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Both quality and quantity of contact with immigrants affect attitudes of majority members towards immigrants. Indeed, friendship with immigrants is a particularly effective way of reducing prejudice (e.g., Pettigrew, 1997). However, a more a fine-grained cross-national analysis of different facets of intergroup contact is called for differentiating quantity and quality of contacts with immigrants (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011) as well as mundane interactions (e.g., Dixon, Durrheim, & Tredoux, 2005) in the neighbourhood (Wagner, van Dick, Pettigrew, & Christ, 2003) and deeper contacts, such as friendships (Christ et al., 2010; Turner, Hewstone, Voci, & Vonofakou, 2008).

In ESS 2002 intergroup contact was assessed with two items: having immigrant friends and having immigrant colleagues at work (D47 and D48). Research with the data from this wave of ESS has shown that contact is negatively related to threat perceptions and anti-immigration stances (Gorodzeisky & Semyonov, 2009; Green, 2007; Green et al. 2010; Schlueter & Wagner, 2008; Schneider, 2008; Sides & Citrin, 2007). Moreover, this data has demonstrated that contact is greater in multi-ethnic neighbourhoods compared to homogenous neighbourhoods (Semyonov & Glikman, 2009) and municipalities with high rather than low proportions of immigrants (Sarrasin et al. in press).

As not all survey respondents are employed, the item assessing contact at the work place is less useful, leaving researchers with a single-item measure of contact. Focusing solely on cross-group friendships (i.e., majority - immigrant friendships) leaves aside other interactions involving intergroup contact. For example, whether everyday contacts occurring in one's neighbourhood reduce prejudice remains unclear. Moreover, a measure of number of intergroup friendships does not allow one to disentangle the quality and quantity of contact.

In addition, the three-point response scale (1=yes, several; 2=yes, a few; 3= no, none at all) used in ESS 2002 was not ideal. The short scale has frequently led to dichotomisation of the scale (e.g., Semyonov & Glickman 2009). Especially in countries or regions with high immigration rates, a longer scale would allow more variation.

Finally, contact with people born abroad is not necessarily the appropriate theoretical measure since for many people contact with the second and third generation is much more likely. Respondents may also be better able to report whether their contacts are from differing ethnic groups than whether they were born in the country or not. The methodological challenges in choosing the appropriate "outgroup" for these items is discussed in Part 4 of this proposal.

New questions on recent 'real world' developments and additional theoretical perspectives: there are a number of developments that any new module ought to cover. Firstly, there has been great policy concern, and academic research (eg the so-called 'Clash of Civilizations') on the difficulties of incorporating Muslims in European societies, and their risks to security (cf the 'War on Terror'). This is one of the major concerns fuelling the backlash against multiculturalism (see Helbling, 2012). Indeed, some authors have argued that Islamophobia is becoming a more salient driver of radical right support than anti-immigrant sentiment (Betz and Meret, 2009; Williams, 2010; Ford and Goodwin, 2010). We

clearly need to measure whether there is greater, or targeted, opposition to Muslim immigration than to other forms of immigration (see Strabac & Listhaug, 2008).

There has also been a great increase of within-EU migration especially from accession countries, which has put great strain on existing infrastructures (eg schools and housing). And there has been great pressure on a number of countries (eg Greece, Malta, Spain, Cyprus) with the increasing number of refugees from conflict-torn states in the middle east and North Africa. Thus, it is crucial to assess the acceptance of receiving people seeking for political asylum.

Recent theoretical work has suggested that, rather than seeing racial prejudice as a unitary phenomenon, racism can instead be conceptualised as comprising two distinct dimensions: biological racism - when people organise their representation of humanity based on the idea of "race", i.e., that human beings can be categorised into racial groups; and cultural racism (or ethnicism) - when people organise their representation of humanity based on the idea of "ethnicity", i.e., that human beings can be categorised into ethnic groups. In contemporary societies therefore diverse modalities of racism coexist, but it is possible to identify theoretical principles underlying the diversity of the phenomenon and, simultaneously, to distinguish it from racial prejudice.

Up until now, with very few exceptions (e.g., Operario & Fiske, 1998), most studies have conceptualised and operationalised racism as a set of negative beliefs and attitudes against Black people (or other racialised outgroups), i.e., racism has been studied as a particular example of prejudice (a negative evaluation against a specific target). However, it is possible to operationalise a distinction between racism and prejudice or racial prejudice, specifying that the former is not a simple negative evaluation of a specific target-group, although it may be related to negative attitudes (racial prejudice) toward outgroups. Instead it could be measured as a general representation about the nature of humanity based on the following core aspects (see Fredrickson, 2002, for an historical approach): categorisation (belief that humanity is organised into racial or ethnic groups); differentiation (belief that the people categorised into groups are deeply different); hierarchy (belief that some groups perceived as different are better than others); essentialism (belief that perceived difference between people categorised into groups are fixed, natural and immutable); "radical-alterity" (belief that not all groups have the typical "human essences").

Introducing items to measure the concept of biological racism will permit a richer theoretical study of the bases of attitudes towards immigration.

The research team

The team brings together scholars experienced in methodology, the substantive topic, in survey design, in comparative research, and in the sociology of ethnicity.

Anthony Heath worked in partnership with Roger Jowell over many years designing the questionnaires for the British Election Studies, of which they were co-directors. He has also experience designing questionnaires for cross-national research (CILS4EU and SDSA) as well as in settings such as Bosnia and India. He has used the ESS items in his published research on attitudes to immigration, has written on the methodology of comparative research, and has led various international teams on the study of ethnic inequalities. He is currently working with social psychologist Miles Hewstone on a study of diversity and social integration. He has published in the American Journal of Sociology, the American Behavioral Scientist, Public Opinion Quarterly, Ethnic and Racial Studies, the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society and the European Sociological Review.

Peter Schmidt was project director for the first German general survey (Allbus) and was a program director at ZUMA (now GESIS Mannheim). With R. Alba and M. Wasmer he was responsible for the design and execution of the first ALLBUS on interethnic relations in Germany in 1996. He has also experience in designing and analyzing questionnaires as editor of the GESIS Handbook of Attitudes (ZIS) and designing questionnaires in a research team (Heitmeyer, Kühnel, Reinecke and Wagner) for the ten-year study on group-related enmity in Germany(2002-2011)

He has worked in recent years with E. Davidov and J. Billiet on editing a book on methods for cross-cultural analysis. Presently he works with S. Schwartz on designing a cross-cultural survey in Russia. His recent research appeared in the European Sociological Review, International Journal of Public Opinion Research, Public Opinion Quarterly, Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Journal of Social Issues, Methodology, Psychological Methods and Survey Research Methods,

Eva G.T. Green is Senior Lecturer in Social Psychology at the University of Lausanne. She has worked on different strands of research on attitudes towards cultural diversity, mainly with surveys (e.g. ESS, ISSP) and experimental data employing advanced statistical techniques. She has investigated the impact of individual- and contextual-level factors on immigration attitudes across Europe and Switzerland, the differences in national attachment between ethnic majority and minority groups, as well as the role of ideological values in explaining ethnic prejudice. Currently, she is PI in a Swiss Election Studies (SELECTS) sub-project on attitudes towards immigrants and party choice in Switzerland. She serves on the governing council of the International Society of Political Psychology. Her recent research has appeared in Political Psychology, Law and Human Behavior, Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, Social Justice Research, Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, Journal of Social Issues, International Journal of Psychology, and the Swiss Political Science Review.

Eldad Davidov is Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Zurich, Switzerland. He applies structural equation modelling to survey data, especially in cross-cultural and longitudinal research. In his applications he uses survey data including the ESS on topics such as human values, national identity or attitudes toward immigration. He is part of an international team led by Shalom Schwartz, that develops improved measurements for human values. His recent methodological and substantive publications have appeared in Psychological Methods, Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Social Science Research, Public Opinion Quarterly, Sociological Methods and Research, Survey Research Methods, Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, International Journal of Comparative Sociology, International Journal of Public Opinion Research, Political Psychology, and Political Analysis. In recent years he has given four ESS-Training courses on comparative data analysis and structural equation modeling.

Alice Ramos has written on social values, prejudice and discrimination, attitudes towards immigrants and immigration and the methodology of cross-national studies: survey techniques; questionnaire design and testing; statistical techniques of comparative and longitudinal data analysis. She is a member of the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) methodological group, on behalf of the Portuguese team and is a member of the Portuguese executive board of the European Social Survey (responsible for the fieldwork coordination of 5 national surveys). She has published in the Portuguese Journal of Social Science and in several edited collections.

Rob Ford is Hallsworth Research Fellow at the University of Manchester. He has written on generational change in racial attitudes, racial hierarchies in immigration attitudes, and the

role of attitudes towards immigrants and minorities in explaining support for the radical right. With Anthony Heath, he has developed and implemented a new module of immigration attitudes questions on the British Social Attitudes survey. He has also developed and tested new measures of sensitivity to social norms sanctioning prejudice (with Scott Blinder and Elisabeth Ivarsflaten) and is currently involved in developing comparative survey experiments to test the impact of race and migration status on support for welfare provision (with Marcel Coenders). His recent research has been published in the British Journal of Sociology, the European Journal of Political Research, Political Studies, Electoral Studies, the Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, the Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties, Sociological Research Online and Party Politics.

PART 2: Advantages & Disadvantages of the timing of the module (max 1000 words)

Ten years on immigration remains a major topic of academic, policy and public concern. The first ESS was conducted in the aftermath of 9/11. Since then the London and Madrid terrorist attacks have taken place. There has been a rise of radical rightwing populism, often politically organised and frequently targeting Muslims. In Britain there is evidence of increasing 'Islamophobia' (Field 2007, Field 2011); in France and Belgium prohibitions again being fully veiled have been introduced; in Switzerland there is now a prohibition against building minarets while immigrants are to be automatically expelled if committing serious crimes. In Germany, Britain and the Netherlands the political community has raised alarms about the effects of multicultural policies and the alleged failure of immigrants to integrate. Research is needed to investigate the effects of this changing political climate and whether the public, especially in those countries that have seen the largest migrant inflows from Muslim countries, has become more sensitive to symbolic threats from migration.

Economic circumstances have also seen dramatic changes since the first wave of the ESS was conducted as a result of the Great Recession and Europe's continuing economic difficulties. Research based on the first wave tended to find strong support for the theory of realistic threat. We might therefore expect to find that anti-immigrant sentiment had increased, especially in those countries that have seen the greatest increases in unemployment competition for jobs, or cutbacks in government welfare programmes (although ongoing work by Ford on Britain and America has cast some empirical doubt on the hypothesis that increased competition has actually been associated with increased anti-immigrant prejudice). The research drawing on the first round of the ESS was necessarily cross-sectional and thus has serious limitations when investigating causal processes. Overtime analysis, particularly comparing changes in competition for jobs and welfare resources with changes in anti-immigrant attitudes provides a much more powerful research design. However, for this design to be maximally effective it will be highly desirable to field the repeat module as soon as possible and before European economies have returned to high levels of employment and rising welfare budgets.

European societies have also been changing demographically as increasing numbers of the children of migrants have now gone through western educational systems, providing much greater opportunities for younger generations (of both minority and majority groups) to have contact with each other. This in turn might lead to widening age (generational) differences in attitudes to immigration (Ford, 2011; 2012). Given the sample sizes in the ESS, a decade since the first round should be long enough to enable some serious analysis of these generational changes. .

Finally, in terms of research, after ten years a large number of papers have been published in a range of disciplines, which allows us to make an informed selection as to which items have been found most valuable by the academic and policy-making communities.

The decade that has now passed since the first round the ESS therefore provides a great opportunity for powerful research designs to investigate a topic of major academic and political concern. We are not aware of any reasons for delaying the module to a later round, and there are important considerations for conducting it as soon as possible.

PART 3: Proposed module design for 30 items (max 3000 words)

As noted above, our general principles are that we should replicate methodologically-sound batteries that measure key concepts and that have been used in published research by other scholars. In addition, we hold that ideally there should be at least three indicators for each concept and that items with reverse wording should be included wherever possible in order to be able to identify or try to control for acquiescence bias. Table 1 shows our provisional recommendations for repeat items.

Table 1: proposed questions for replication

Concept	Indicator	Item
Opposition to immigration	D4 (Included in core)	Now, using this card, to what extent do you think [country] should allow people of the same race or ethnic group as most [country] people to come and live here
	D5 (Included in core)	How about people of a different race or ethnic group from most [country] people?
	D6	Now, still using this card, to what extent do you think [country] should allow people from the richer countries in Europe to come and live here?
	D7	And how about people from the poorer countries in Europe?
	D8	To what extent do you think [country] should allow people from the richer countries outside Europe to come and live here?
	D9 (included in core)	How about people from the poorer countries outside Europe?
The items included in the core are shown here for completeness. They will not be included in the 30 item count for the module. These items have been shown to have excellent methodological properties with respect to equivalence of meaning. (See Davidov et al 2008a)		

Criteria for entry/exclusion		Please tell me how important you think each of these things should be in deciding whether someone born, brought up and living outside [country] should be able to come and live here. Please use this card. Firstly, how important should it be for them to
	D10	...have good educational qualifications?
	D12	be able to speak [country]'s official language(s)
	D13	come from a Christian background?
	D14	be white?
	D16	have work skills that [country] needs?
	D17	be committed to the way of life in [country]?
Items D10 and D16 have been shown to have excellent methodological properties (Davidov et al 2008a). We propose to retain the above six items, dropping two extra items from the original battery. The six proposed are those used by Bail (2008) and proved to convincing cross-national variation in symbolic boundaries (see also Green, 2007, 2009). The two other items in the original battery which we propose to drop do not appear to have been used often and are excluded (D11 "Having family living in the country" did fit the theoretical distinction between acquired and ascribed criteria (Green, 2009), whereas D14 "Being wealthy" had been erroneously translated as "Being healthy" e.g., in France).		
Realistic threat		Using this card, please say how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Firstly...
	D18	Average wages and salaries are generally brought down by people coming to live and work here
	D25	Using this card, would you say that people who come to live here generally take jobs away from workers in [country], or generally help to create new jobs?
	D26	Most people who come to live here work and pay taxes. They also use health and welfare services. On balance, do you think people who come here take out more than they put in or put in more than they take out?
	D27 (Included in core)	Would you say it is generally bad or good for [country]'s economy that people come to live here from other countries?
The original module contained six items but we suggest that the four listed above will be sufficient to generate a reliable scale and dropping the extra ones will provide room for a wider range of measures.		
Symbolic threat	D28 (Included in core)	And, using this card, would you say that [country]'s cultural life is generally undermined or enriched by people coming to live here from other countries?
It is clearly essential to retain this key measure of symbolic threat from the original module. It will be supplemented by two additional items (see below).		

Security threat	D30	Are [country]'s crime problems made worse or better by people coming to live here from other countries?
Prejudice/social distance		And now thinking of people who have come to live in [country] from another country who are of a different race or ethnic group from most [country] people. How much would you mind or not mind if someone like this....
	D36	was appointed as your boss?
	D37	married a close relative of yours?
These are two classic social distance questions that go back conceptually to the work of Bogardus.		
Discrimination		How good or bad are each of these things for a country?
	D45	A law against racial or ethnic discrimination in the workplace.
	D46	A law against promoting racial or ethnic hatred
These two items provide a valuable measure of attitudes towards concrete policy issues of continuing relevance, and have been used successfully in our research (Ramos et al., 2008; Sarasin et al., in press)		
Attitudes to integration policy		Using this card, please tell me how much you agree or disagree with each of these statements. Firstly...
	D40	It is better for a country if almost everyone shares the same customs and traditions
	D43	Communities of people who have come to live here should be allowed to educate their children in their own separate schools if they wish
These two items pick up the two crucial sides of the debates about assimilation and multiculturalism, and again have been important variables in our research (Green, 2009)		
Group size	D56	Out of every 100 people living in [country], how many do you think were born outside [country]?
Perception of group size is an important as research has shown both that 'actual' group size is frequently misunderstood and that perceived size is needed when modelling threat.		

Improved measures of symbolic threat

As noted above, there was only one item in the original module to measure symbolic threat, the original module giving much greater weight to items measuring realistic threat. In order to have a more balanced set of measures of these two concepts we proposed to add the following two items.

Table 2: new items to improve measurement of existing concepts

Symbolic threat	NEW 1	These days, I am afraid that [country] culture is threatened by ethnic minorities.
	NEW 2	Immigrants improve [country] society by bringing in new ideas and cultures
The first item has been drawn from Sniderman et al. (2004) and was fielded in the Netherlands. The second comes from the ISSP 2003 national identity module. It is positively		

worded in order not to have a battery of three items all worded in the same direction.

New measures of contact

As noted above, there were two items in the original module that measured contact with migrants, but these had a number of methodological weaknesses (see Christ & Wagner, in press for methodological challenges in contact research). We propose the following items which have been developed by social psychologists and more closely geared to measuring the key distinctions made in the extensive psychological research on inter-group contact.

Table 3: new items to measure contact

Contact		We would now like to ask you a few questions about the people in your neighbourhood. By neighbourhood, we mean the area within 15-20 minutes walking distance from where you live.
Actual contact	NEW 3	How often, if at all, do you mix socially with people from <OUTGROUPER> in your neighbourhood? Never, Very rarely, Sometimes, Quite often, Very often
Weak ties	NEW 4	How often, if at all, do you have brief everyday encounters with people from <OUTGROUPER>, which might involve exchanging a couple of words, for example, in corner shops, buying a paper and so on? Never, Very rarely, Sometimes, Quite often, Very often
		The next few questions are about your friends.
Strong ties	NEW 5	What proportion of your close friends are <OUTGROUPER>? None or very few, A few, About half, A lot, Almost all or all
To distinguish quality from quantity	NEW 6	And how often, if at all, do you spend time with your friends from <OUTGROUPER>? Never, Very rarely, Sometimes, Quite often, Very often
These four items enable us to distinguish strong from weak ties and to make some investigation for quality and quantity of ties. We also need to consider whether we need to filter these questions (on own ethnicity) with a parallel set of questions for immigrants/ethnic minorities (for paradoxical effects of intergroup contact among minorities, e.g., see Dixon, Durrheim & Tredoux, 2007 for findings from a South African survey).		

New measures to take account of changes over the last decade

There is a need to include a modest number of new items in order to address some of the major developments in migration within Europe over the last decade. These developments include the rise of Islamophobia (Field 2007, 2011; Esposito & Kalin, 2011), the enlargement of the EU and the increased migration flows from accession countries, and the flows of refugees and asylum-seekers from war torn countries in the middle-east and Africa. Given space constraints, we propose the following two items. We suggest that a high priority is to include at least one question on Muslims. Strong cases could however be made for alternatives to the asylum seekers questions: for example migration from the EU accession

countries is potentially important, although it would not be such an appropriate item to ask in non-EU countries.

Table 4: new items to take account of recent developments in Europe

		Now, using this card, to what extent do you think [country] should allow people from the following groups to come and live here?
Attitudes to asylum seekers	NEW 7	People seeking political asylum
Attitudes to Muslim migrants	NEW 8	People coming from Muslim countries who wish to work in [country]
These two items are derived from a battery in Eurobarometer 2000 for the special report on Racism and Xenophobia in Europe (report 138). However, we have space for only two of the Eurobarometer battery. We have also modified the question wording slightly, and the response codes, so that the items fit into the same format as used for the 'opposition to immigration' items in table 1 above. There might be a case for retaining the original Eurobarometer wording in order to maximize comparability over time.		

Table 5: new items to measure additional theoretical constructs

		Using this card, please tell me how much you agree or disagree with each of these statements. Firstly...
Biological racism	NEW 9	The human species is divided into racial groups that are very different from each other
	NEW 10	Our racial nature should be mixed with the characteristics of other racial groups (reversed).
The two proposed items operationalise the biological dimension of racism (see Vala & Pereira, 2012).		

PART 4: Methodological or Practical difficulties (max 2000 words)

Comparing constructs across groups within countries, across countries or longitudinally in a meaningful way requires determining whether the measurement characteristics of the relevant constructs are equivalent across nations, groups and time points (eg Steenkamp and Baumgartner 1998; Billiet 2003; Davidov, Schmidt and Billiet 2011; Millsap 2011). Only if such equivalence is established can researchers make meaningful and clearly interpretable cross-national and longitudinal comparisons of the constructs and their associations with other variables. Otherwise, if equivalence is absent, observed differences in means or other statistics might reflect differences in systematic biases of response or different understanding of the concepts, rather than substantive differences. Equally important,

findings of no difference between countries do not ensure the absence of “real” differences. Measurement equivalence and the appropriateness of the questions to the different national contexts thus cannot be taken for granted and has to be empirically tested, in particular when the number of contextual units is as large as that in the ESS. Indeed, repeating several questions introduced in the previous module on immigration will allow studying attitudinal change over more than 10 years in response to external developments such as political and cultural events, or changing economic conditions. Such studies will also require guaranteeing that the measures are longitudinally equivalent, as the meaning of items may change over time as the context changes. Previous analyses have shown that not all items in the previous immigration module are understood similarly across countries and some evoke response bias in a different way across countries (Davidov, Meuleman, Billiet and Schmidt 2008). Such items are a threat to a meaningful cross-national or longitudinal comparison. Introducing multiple and reliable indicators to measure each construct will enable to control for measurement errors and test for equivalence of the concepts using various techniques, such as structural equation modelling and a multiple group comparison.

Measurement equivalence is threatened by various issues. Our proposal allows controlling for at least three of them. To address random and non-random measurement errors we introduce several items to measure each dimension (Brown 2006). At least two, but ideally three to four related items are needed to be able to control for various types of measurement error.

A second threat is the problem of response bias. Individuals in different cultures are susceptible to different levels of yes-saying tendency (acquiescence) or other forms of bias (like choosing the extreme or the middle category). Introducing balanced scales of items (with some items positively formulated and others negatively formulated) to measure various dimensions of attitudes toward immigration will allow researchers to control for this nonrandom error or to introduce a latent variable to account for the response style (Billiet and Davidov 2008). After such an adjustment, interpretations of comparisons of the substantive variables’ parameters, their effects and means across countries will take into account systematic response differences across countries and will be more meaningful and the comparability of the scales will increase.

Third, a major challenge is to find a suitable term for ‘outgroupers’ that works cross-nationally and, ideally, for both members of the ingroup and outgroup. This is important in order to increase chances of achieving measurement equivalence. The term ‘ethnic minorities’ might not be suitable, since it might be taken to refer to national minorities (eg Scots in Great Britain) and not simply to migrants and their children. Similarly the term ‘foreigner’ will not be appropriate as many migrants may have come with, or subsequently acquired, citizenship of the country of residence. ‘People coming from other countries’ is somewhat wordy but may be the best alternative. This will clearly need very careful consideration during the questionnaire design phase.

References

- Aleksynska, M. (2011). Civic Participation of Immigrants in Europe: Assimilation, Origin and Destination Country Effects. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 27(3): 566-585
- Bail, Christopher (2008). The Configuration of Symbolic Boundaries against Immigrants in Europe. *American Sociological Review February* 73 (1): 37-59
- Billiet, J. (2003) Cross-Cultural Equivalence with Structural Equation Modeling, in J.A. Harkness, F.J.R. Van de Vijver, and P.P. Mohler (eds), *Cross-Cultural Survey Methods*, pp. 247-264. New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Billiet, J.B. and E. Davidov (2008). Testing the Stability of an Acquiescence Style Factor Behind Two Interrelated Substantive Variables in a Panel Design. *Sociological Methods and Research*, 36, 542-562.
- Brown, T. A. (2006). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Betz, H and Meret, S (2009). Revisiting Lepanto: the political mobilization against Islam in contemporary Europe, *Patterns of Prejudice*, 43(3):313-334
- Brown, R., & Hewstone, M. (2005). An integrative theory of intergroup contact. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 37, pp. 255-343). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Ceobanu, A. M., & Escandell, X. (2010). Comparative analyses of public attitudes toward immigrants and immigration using multinational survey data: A review of theories and research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36, 309-328.
- Christ, O., Hewstone, M., Tausch, N., Wagner, U., Voci, A., Hughes, J., & Cairns, E. (2010). Direct contact as a moderator of extended contact effects: Cross-sectional and longitudinal impact on outgroup attitudes, behavioral intentions, and attitude certainty. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 36, 1662-1674.
- Christ, O. & Wagner, U. (in press). Methodological issues in the study of intergroup contact: Towards a new wave of research. In G. Hodson & M Hewstone (eds.), *Advances in Intergroup Contact*. Psychology Press.
- Citrin, Jack, and John Sides (2008). Immigration and the Imagined Community in Europe and the United States. *Political Studies* 56 (1): 33-56.
- Coenders M., Lubbers M., Scheepers P. (2005). *Majorities' attitudes towards minorities, findings from the Eurobarometer and the European Social Survey*. Vienna: European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia .
- Davidov, Eldad, Bart Meuleman, Jaak Billiet, and Peter Schmidt. (2008). Values and support for immigration: a cross-country comparison. *European Sociological Review* 24:583-599.
- Davidov, E., Schmidt, P., and Schwartz, S. (2008). Bringing values back in. The adequacy of the European Social Survey to measure values in 20 countries. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 72: 420-445.
- Davidov, Eldad, P.Schmidt and J.Billiet (eds.) (2011). *Cross-Cultural Analysis. Methods and Applications*. New York. Routledge: Taylor and Francis.
- Dixon, John, Kevin Durrheim and Colin Tredoux (2005). Beyond the Optimal Contact Strategy: A Reality Check for the Contact Hypothesis. *American Psychologist*, 60(7): 697-711.
- Dixon, J., Durrheim, K., & Tredoux, C. (2007). Intergroup Contact and Attitudes Toward the Principle and Practice of Racial Equality. *Psychological Science*, 18(10) : 867-872
- Esposito, J and Kalin, I. (eds) (2011). *Islamophobia: The Challenge of Pluralism in the 21st Century*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

- Esses, Victoria, John F. Dovidio, Linda A. Jackson, and Tamara L. Armstrong. (2001). The immigration dilemma: the role of perceived group competition, ethnic prejudice, and national identity. *Journal of Social Issues* 57 (3):389-412.
- Eurobarometer (2000). *Special report on attitudes towards minority groups in the European Union*: European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EB report 138).
- Field, Clive D. (2007). Islamophobia in contemporary Britain: the evidence of the opinion polls, 1988-2006, *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, 18: 447-77
- Field Clive D. (2011). Revisiting Islamophobia in contemporary Britain: opinion-poll findings for 2007-10. In Marc Helbling (ed.) *Islamophobia in the West: Measuring and Explaining Individual Attitudes*, London: Routledge
- Ford, R. and Goodwin, M. (2010). Angry White Men: Individual and Contextual Predictors of Support for the British National Party, *Political Studies* 58(1):1-25
- Ford, R. (2011). Acceptable and unacceptable immigrants: the ethnic hierarchy in British immigration preferences, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37(7): 1017-1037
- Ford, R. (2012). *Europe's Young Cosmopolitans: Explaining Generational Differences in Immigration Attitudes*, University of Manchester Institute for Social Change working paper.
- Frederickson, G. (2002). *Racism: A Short History*. NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gorodzeisky, A and M. Semyonov. (2009). Terms of exclusion: Public views toward admission and allocation of rights to immigrants in European countries. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 32: 401-423.
- Gorodzeisky, A. (2011). Who are the Europeans that Europeans Prefer? Economic conditions and Exclusionary views toward European immigrants. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 52: 100-113.
- Green, Eva G.T. (2007). Guarding the gates of Europe: A typological analysis of immigration attitudes across 21 countries. *International Journal of Psychology* 42 (6): 365-79.
- Green, Eva G. T. (2009). Who can enter? A Multilevel Analysis on Public Support for Immigration Criteria across 20 European Countries. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations* 12(1): 41-60.
- Green E.G.T., N. Fasel and O. Sarasin (2010). The More the Merrier? The Effects of Type of Cultural Diversity on Exclusionary Immigration Attitudes in Switzerland. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 4(2): 177-190.
- Green, E. G. T., & Staerklé, C. (forthcoming). Immigration and multiculturalism. In L. Huddy, D. O. Sears, & J. Levy (Eds.) *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*.
- Hainmueller J., & Hiscox M.J. (2007). Educated Preferences: Explaining Attitudes Toward Immigration in Europe. *International Organization*, 61(2), pp.399-442
- Heath, A.F., C. Rothson and E. Kilpi. (2008). The second generation in Western Europe: education, unemployment and occupational attainment. *Annual Review of Sociology* 34: 211-35.
- Heath, A.F. and N. Demireva (forthcoming) Has multiculturalism utterly failed? *Ethnic and Racial Studies*.
- Helbling, Marc (ed.) (2012) *Islamophobia in the West. Measuring and Explaining Individual Attitudes*. London: Routledge.
- Herda, D. (2010). How Many Immigrants? Foreign-Born Population Innumeracy in Europe. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 74(4), pp.674-695
- Hjerm, M., (2009). Anti-Immigrant Attitudes and Cross-Municipal Variation in the Proportion of Immigrants. *Acta Sociologica*, 52(1), pp.47-62
- Ivarsflaten E. (2007). What Unites Right-Wing Populists in Western Europe? Re-Examining Grievance Mobilization Models in Seven Successful Cases. *Comparative Political Studies*, 41(1): 3-23

- McLaren, L. M. (2003). Anti-immigrant prejudice in Europe: Contact, threat perception, and preferences for the exclusion of migrants. *Social Forces*, 81, 909-936.
- Meuleman, Bart, Eldad Davidov, and Jaak Billiet (2009). Changing attitudes towards immigration in Europe 2001-2007: A dynamic group conflict theory approach. *Social Science Research* 38 (2): 352-65.
- Millsap, R. (2011) *Statistical Approaches to Measurement Invariance*. New York: Routledge: Taylor and Francis.
- Oesch D. (2008). Explaining Workers' Support for Right-Wing Populist Parties in Western Europe: Evidence from Austria, Belgium, France, Norway, and Switzerland. *International Political Science Review*, 29(3), pp.349-373.
- Operario, D, & Fiske, ST. (1998). Racism equals power plus prejudice: A social psychological equation for racial oppression. In J.A. Edberhardt, & S.T. Fiske (Eds.), *Racism: The problem and the response* (pp. 33-54). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pereira, Cícero, Jorge Vala, and Rui Costa-Lopes. (2010). From prejudice to discrimination: The legitimizing role of the perceived threat in discrimination against immigrants. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 40: 1231-1250.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 173-185.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 751-783.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. M. (2011). *When groups meet: The dynamics of intergroup contact*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Preston, I., Bauer, T., Card, D., Dustmann, C., & Nazroo, J. (2001). *European Social Survey Round 1 module proposal. Proposal for a Module on Immigration and Attitudes*.
- Quillian, L. (1995). Prejudice as a response to perceived group threat: Population composition and anti-immigrant and racial prejudice in Europe. *American Sociological Review*, 60,: 586-611.
- Ramos, A. Vala,J., and Pereira, C. (2008). Oposição a políticas anti-racistas na Europa: factores individuais e socio-estruturais [Opposition to anti-racial policies: individual and sociostructural factors]. In Manuel V.Cabral, Karin Wall, Sofia Aboim and Filice C. Silva (orgs). Itinerários- A investigação nos 25 anos do ICS [Itineraries - research in the 25 years of the ICS]. Lisboa: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais, pp.257-281
- Riek, B. M., E. W. Mania, and S. L. Gaertner. (2006). Intergroup threat and outgroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10(4): 336-353.
- Rydgren J. (2008). Immigration sceptics, xenophobes or racists? Radical right-wing voting in six West European countries. *European Journal of Political Research*, 47(6): 737-765
- Sarrasin, O., Green, E. G. T., Fasel, N., Christ, O., Staerklé, C., & Clémence, A. (in press). Opposition to anti-racism laws across Swiss municipalities: A multilevel analysis. *Political Psychology*.
- Scheepers, P., Gijssberts, M., & Coenders, M. (2002). Ethnic exclusion in European countries. Public opposition to civil rights for legal migrants as a response to perceived ethnic threat. *European Sociological Review*, 18, 17-34.
- Schlueter, Elmar, and Ulrich Wagner. (2008). Regional differences matter: examining the dual influence of the regional size of the immigrant population on derogation of immigrants in Europe. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 49 (2-3):153-173.
- Schneider, Silke L. (2008). Anti-immigrant attitudes in Europe: out-group size and perceived ethnic threat. *European Sociological Review* 24 (1):53-67.

- Sears, D. O. and C. L. Funk, (1990). Self-Interest in Americans' Political Opinions. In J. J. Mansbridge (Ed.), *Beyond Self-Interest*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press: pp. 147-170.
- Sears, D. O. & Henry, P. J. (2005). Over thirty years later: A contemporary look at symbolic racism and its critics. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (pp. 95-150). New York: Academic Press.
- Semyonov, M. and A. Glickman. (2009). Ethnic residential segregation, social contacts, and anti-minority attitudes in European societies. *European Sociological Review* 25: 693–708.
- Sidanius, Jim, and Felicia Pratto (1999). *Social Dominance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sides, John, and Jack Citrin. (2007). European opinion about immigration: the role of identities, interests, and information. *British Journal of Political Science* 37:477-504.
- Sniderman, Paul M., Louk Hagendoorn, and Markus Prior (2004). Predisposing factors and situational triggers: exclusionary reaction to immigrant minorities. *American Political Science Review* 98 (1):35-49.
- Steenkamp, J.-B.E.M. and Baumgartner, H. (1998). Assessing Measurement Invariance in Cross-National Consumer Research. *Journal of Consumer Research* 25: 78-90.
- Stephan, W. G., and C. L. Renfro (2002). The role of threat in intergroup relations. In D. M. Mackie and E. R. Smith (Eds.), *From prejudice to intergroup emotions: Differentiated reactions to social groups*. New York: Psychology Press: 191–207
- Strabac, Zan, and Ola Listhaug. (2008). Anti-muslim prejudice in Europe: a multilevel analysis of survey data from 30 countries. *Social Science Research* 37 (1): 268-286.
- Turner, R.N., Hewstone, M., Voci, A., Vonofakou, C. (2008). A test of the extended contact hypothesis: The mediating role of intergroup anxiety, perceived ingroup and outgroup norms, and inclusion of the outgroup in the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 843-860.
- Vala, Jorge and Cícero Pereira (2012). Racism: An evolving virus. In F. Bettencourt (Ed.), *Racism and Ethnic Relations in the Portuguese-Speaking World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wagner, U., Van Dick, R., Pettigrew, T. F., & Christ, O. (2003). Ethnic prejudice in East and West Germany: The explanatory power of intergroup contact. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 6, 22-36.
- Williams, M (2010). Can Leopards Change their Spots? Between Xenophobia and Trans-Ethnic Populism Among Western European Far Right Parties. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 16(1):11-134